

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

16 JUN 1993

Docket-222

RECEIVED

JUN 18 1993
IN REPLY REFER TO:
7330-7/1700
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Honorable Richard Lugar
United States Senate
306 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Lugar:

This is in reply to your letter of May 28, 1993, in which you inquired on behalf of your constituent, Ritron, Inc., regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992). This Notice proposes comprehensive changes to the Commission's Rules governing the private land mobile radio services operating in the frequency bands below 512 MHz.

The proposals in the Notice reflect to a large extent concepts and proposals submitted in the initial inquiry stages of this proceeding. None of the

[REDACTED]

Generational



RICHARD G. LUGAR
INDIANA

SH 306 SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510
202-224-4814

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1401

COMMITTEES:

FOREIGN RELATIONS

AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY
RANKING MEMBER

SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

PRB
92-235

2402

May 28, 1993

Federal Communication Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: The Matter of

Replacement of Part 90 by Part 88 to
Revise the Private Land Mobile Radio
Services and Modify the Policies
Governing Them

)
)
) PR Docket No. 92-235
)
)
)

RECEIVED
JUN 11 7 11 AM '93
PRIVATE

Dear Chairman:

I would like to share with you the comments I have received from Ritron, Inc., a company based in Carmel, Indiana who is highly concerned with PR Docket No. 92-235. I have heard from several hundred constituents who have voiced their opposition to the proposed changes.

The following text displays the viewpoint of Ritron. I ask that you consider all arguments to this proposed docket prior to your final decision.

Ritron's Comments

1. Industry experts estimate that the current installed base of 2-way radio equipment affected by this NPRM represents a 25 billion dollar investment. The majority of this equipment is owned by American business. If the NPRM actually becomes rule, the installed base of equipment will become obsolete in 1996, this is in spite of the fact that radio equipment typically has a useful life of 15-20 years.

Basically, there is an incompatibility problem that the FCC is ignoring in this NPRM. The existing installed base of 2-way radio equipment is designed to meet current FCC regulations. The NPRM radically changes these regulations and will make the new radios incompatible with existing radios. Also, the new radios will interfere with the existing radios to such an extent that they will become useless, to the tune of 25 billion dollars. The replacement cost of this equipment, if a company can afford to replace it will be dramatically higher than initial acquisition costs.

The investment in professional land-mobile radio systems represents a large part of the nation's investment in its

communication infrastructure. This infrastructure is as important to America as bridges and roads. Just as the Federal Government wouldn't blow up a bridge, it should not destroy this investment in private 2-way radio equipment. In difficult economic times such as these, the last thing American businesses, cities, and counties need is the Federal Government acting in haste and obsoleting 25 billion dollars of perfectly good communications equipment.

2. The NPRM will result in higher priced equipment to the end user. Currently, an entry level 2-way radio costs the end user less than \$200 per unit. This price will increase dramatically if the NPRM goes into effect. New technologies will need to be developed in order to build a 2-way radio that meets the rules in the NPRM. If the NPRM goes through, radio users who need a high degree of reliability and wide-area coverage will be forced to pay high monthly charges to use trunked, air-time billed, SMR systems.

3. The NPRM is anti-competitive. The NPRM fosters technology that will lead to "closed system formats" that will essentially lock in a radio user to a single manufacturer. The majority of radio equipment manufacturer are backing the NPRM. They see a bonanza in new equipment sales.

4. The NPRM will increase the cost of doing business for radio users. The service providers (companies that sell air-time) are also pushing heavily for the NPRM. They see hundreds of millions of annual air-time charges for services that are currently free.

5. The FCC is attempting to increase the channel capacity of the radio spectrum that serves Private Radio. There is a need for more radio channels in a few large cities, however, there are other solutions to the problem. For instance, HR 707 authored by Congressman John Dingell, Chairman of the Committee on Commerce and Energy. This bill would essentially take unused radio spectrum now assigned to the Federal Government and reassign it to the Private Radio Service. This spectrum could then be earmarked for the high technology systems like those promoted in PR Docket No. 92-235.

Based upon the comments my office has received, I would ask that the FCC consider postponing any changes until an orderly

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. I look